

School of Theology at Claremont



10011441404

THE
INSTITUTE
FOR
ANTIQUITY
AND
CHRISTIANITY

•
The
Claremont
Graduate
School

NAG HAMMADI:
THE FIRST FIFTY YEARS

by James M. Robinson

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
NUMBER 34

A CENTER FOR BASIC RESEARCH
IN THE ORIGINS AND MEANING
OF EARLY CHRISTIAN CULTURAL HERITAGE:

BT
1391
R63
1995
ANT NEAR EAST
ICAL CULTURE
E AND ROME
CAL WORLDS
ND CHRISTIANITY

OCCASIONAL PAPERS
of
THE INSTITUTE FOR ANTIQUITY AND CHRISTIANITY

Editor: Jon Ma. Asgeirsson

Robert H. Eisenn

James D. Hester

Ronald F. Hock

F. Stanley Jones

Karen L. King

Rolf P. Knierim

Burton L. Mack

Marvin W. Meyer



The Library
of the
School of Theology
at Claremont

Edward N. O'Neil

Birger A. Pearson

Gesine S. Robinson

James A. Sanders

Tammi J. Schneider

Teresa M. Shaw

Marvin A. Sweeney

Karen J. Torjesen

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

The OCCASIONAL PAPERS are published by the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 831 North Dartmouth Avenue, Claremont, CA 91711-6178 for the members of the Society for Antiquity and Christianity. Annual fees for Society membership are \$50.00. The annual library subscription fee to both the BULLETIN and OCCASIONAL PAPERS of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity is \$25.00. Individual copies of this paper may be acquired from the Institute for a prepaid fee of \$10.00. This issue was produced in November and distributed in December of 1995.

BT
1391
R63
1995

Nag Hammadi: The First Fifty Years*

James M. Robinson,
The Claremont Graduate School

Introduction

I have been asked to speak about the significance of the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices 50 years ago, in terms of what the Nag Hammadi codices have meant for the discipline of New Testament scholarship. This significance is not limited to such specific issues as Gnosticism and the New Testament. My focus here is rather in terms of the sociology of knowledge: What has this important manuscript discovery, and the way it was handled over the past half-century, effected in the shape of Biblical Studies as a discipline?

But first, to give you a taste of the discovery itself, let me begin with how we know that it took place 50 years ago, before I trace what happened during the first 50 years.

* A Plenary Address given at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature on the occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Nag Hammadi Discovery on November 19, 1995. A previous version of this lecture was given at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity on September 21, 1995.

The young French graduate student and adventurer, Jean Doresse, originally the only source of information about the discovery, had dated it variously and without explanation to early in 1946,¹ then 1946,² then 1945,³ then 1947⁴

¹ Jean Doresse and Togo Mina collaborated in preparing announcements made by Henri-Charles Puech to the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres in Paris on February 20, 1948. See Henri-Charles Puech and Jean Doresse, "Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Egypte," Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: *Comptes Rendus des Séances de l'Année 1948* (1948): 89 and by Togo Mina to the Institut d'Égypte in Cairo on March 8, 1948, see his "Le papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte," *VigChr* 2 (1948): 129, in which Mina stated the date of the discovery as "about two years ago—it has not been possible to establish the exact date." The typescript composed by Doresse for the presentation to the French Academy cited the acquisition of Codex III by the Coptic Museum in October 1946 and the examination of other codices by the unnamed Jacques Schwartz "more than a year and a half ago" to conclude "as a result the find would date perhaps from the beginning of 1946." But in editing the typescript Puech deleted "more than," thus obscuring any evidence of a date prior to August 1946, though in fact Schwartz' examination took place late in March 1946, as he has informed me.

² Henri-Charles Puech, "Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts à Nag Hammadi," *RHR* 134 (1948): 244. In his essay "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Egypte (premier inventaire et essai d'identification)," in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum* (Boston: The Byzantine Institute of America, 1950), 93, he was even less certain: "in the course of 1946 ... at a date itself imprecise." Doresse followed suit: "It was about 1946," in "Une bibliothèque gnostique copte," *La Nouvelle Clío* 2 (1949): 61. The date of 1946 persisted even after it had been replaced: Doresse, "A Gnostic Library from Upper Egypt," *Archaeology* 3 (1950): 69; Pahor Labib, "Les papyrus gnostiques coptes du Musée Copte du Vieux Caire," *La Revue du Caire* 195-196 (1956): 275.

³ "Toward 1945": Doresse, "Sur les traces des papyrus gnostiques: Recherches à Chénoboskion," Académie royale de Belgique: *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres et des Sciences morales et politiques*, 5ème Série, 36 (1950): 433; *Les livres secrets des gnostiques d'Égypte*, I: *Introduction aux écrits gnostiques coptes découverts à Khénoboskion* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1958) 145; II: *L'Évangile selon Thomas ou les paroles secrètes de Jésus* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1959), 1; Henri-Charles Puech, "Découverte d'une bibliothèque gnostique en Haute-Egypte," in *Encyclopédie Française*, Vol. 19, *Philosophie. Religion*, ed., L.P.V. Febvre (Paris: Société Nouvelle de l'Encyclopédie Française, 1957), 19.42.5. "In 1945": Doresse, "Les gnostiques d'Égypte," *La Table Ronde* 107 (1956): 86.

⁴ "Une importante découverte: Un papyrus gnostique copte du IVème siècle," *La Bourse Égyptienne*, January 10, 1948, reprinted in *Chronique d'Égypte* 23 (1948): 260. This dating is based on the acquisition of Codex III by the Coptic Museum, stated to have been "a few months ago." In fact this reference only fits the time when Doresse first saw it in October 1947 (the acquisition date was October 4, 1946). See Doresse, "Le roman d'une grande découverte," *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* (July 25, 1957): 1: "The discovery had begun the day when the lamented Togo Mina ... made for his collections the fortunate purchase ... That took place in 1947. Shortly

or even 1948.⁵ Hence I sought to find more precise information about the time, place, participants, and other specifics of the discovery.

The most obvious place to begin had apparently never been consulted, the Acquisitions Registry of the Coptic Museum in Cairo. Here the name of the person who sold the first codex, Codex III, to the Coptic Museum on October 4, 1946 for LE 250 is listed by name: Rāghib Andarāwus "al-Qiss" 'Abd al-Sayyid. I tracked him down in retirement in the town of Qinā in Upper Egypt, and he gave me information making it possible to unravel the whole story, with the help of the discoverer himself, Muḥammad 'Alī al-Sammān in the hamlet al-Qaṣr across the Nile from Nag Hammadi.

Muḥammad 'Alī is an illiterate field hand not capable of putting a calendar date to anything, much less the discovery. But it was associated in his mind with two things much more important to him at the time: When the local sugarcane harvest was over and the land was fallow during the brief winter, he regularly dug at the foot of the cliff soft earth that served as fertilizer for the fields. He had been digging fertilizer, he recalled, just a few weeks before the Coptic Christmas, which is January 6, when he made the discovery. This suggests the discovery was in a December.

With regard to the year, he again could speak of it only in terms more important to him at the time: The murder of his father in a blood feud.⁶ He

afterwards ... Togo Mina submitted this codex to me." But 1947 then became the unambiguous date of the discovery itself, "Une extraordinaire découverte archéologique en Haute-Egypte: Quarante-neuf livres secrètes relèvent la religion gnostique," in "La vie littéraire" of *La Tribune de Genève*, February 1-2, 1958, 13: "the discovery made in 1947 to the north of Luxor."

⁵ From an interview with Doresse by Georges Fradier, *UNESCO Features* 2 (August 1, 1949): 11: "It was a year ago, on the shore of the Nile"

⁶ Muḥammad 'Alī's memory of that tragedy: One night his father, a night watchman for valuable irrigation machinery that had been imported from Germany, killed a marauder from the nearby village Ḥamra Dūm, a village that had an ongoing blood feud with Muḥammad 'Alī's own village al-Qaṣr. The next day that murder was avenged, in that Muḥammad 'Alī's father was found shot through the head, lying beside the remains of the man from Ḥamra Dūm he had

regretted he had to wait some half a year before the opportunity came to avenge his father's death, by murdering the man who did it.⁷ But this new victim was from Ḥamra Dūm, the opposing village in the long-standing blood feud with al-Qaṣr. Since Ḥamra Dūm lay just at the foot of the cliff on whose talus the discovery had been made, it claimed that area as its turf. Hence Muḥammad 'Alī's act of vengeance meant that he no longer dared return to the area of the discovery, which had taken place less than a month before he avenged his father's death. So if the date of the father's death could be established, the date of the discovery itself about half a year later could be calculated.

The Nag Hammadi Real Estate Taxation Office maintains a Registry of Deaths. A Copt I knew worked there, and was able to locate the entry, giving the cause of death as "unknown" and the date in 1945 of May 7. If the vengeance was some half a year later, about a month after the discovery, the discovery itself had to have been in November or December 1945. Voilà, our fiftieth anniversary date!⁸

killed. Muḥammad 'Alī's mother, beside herself, told her seven sons to keep their mattocks sharp so as to be ready when an occasion for revenge presented itself.

⁷ Muḥammad 'Alī's memory of the revenge: Someone ran to his house to tell the family that the murderer Aḥmad Ismā'īl was asleep in the heat of the day on a dirt road nearby, with a jug of sugarcane molasses, the local product, by his side. The sons grabbed their mattocks, fell on the hapless person before he could flee, hacked him up, cut open his heart, and, dividing it among them, ate it raw, the ultimate act of blood vengeance.

⁸ The story of the blood feud came out in connection with Muḥammad 'Alī explaining why he would not accompany me to the cliff to show me the site of the discovery. So I had to go to Ḥamra Dūm myself, find the son of Aḥmad Ismā'īl, the man Muḥammad 'Alī had butchered, and get his assurance that, since he had long since shot up a funeral *cortège* of Muḥammad 'Alī's family, wounding Muḥammad 'Alī and killing a number of his clan, he considered the score settled. Hence he would not feel honor-bound to attack Muḥammad 'Alī if he returned to the foot of the cliff. I took this good news back to Muḥammad 'Alī, who opened his shirt, showed me his scar, bragged that he had been shot but not killed, yet emphasized that if he ever laid eyes on Aḥmad Ismā'īl again, he would kill him on the spot. As a result of this display of a braggadocio's fearlessness, he could be persuaded to go to the cliff, camouflaged in my clothes, in a government jeep, with me sitting on the bullets side facing the village and him on the safer cliff side, at dusk in Ramadan, when all good Muslims are at home gorging themselves after fasting throughout the daylight hours.

I propose now to address four dimensions of what has taken place in the half-century since the Nag Hammadi discovery:

1. The First Half of the Fifty Years: The Monopolizing of the Bulk of the Nag Hammadi Codices from 1945 to 1970

Of course, the codices had first to move from the foot of the cliff into the control of the monopolists. This happened as follows:⁹

Muḥammad ʿAlī had at first feared to open the jar, lest it contain a jinn. But then it occurred to him it might contain gold. This gave him courage enough to break it with his mattock. Out flew, up into the air, what he thought might be an airy golden jinn, but I suspect was only papyrus fragments. He was very let down to find only worthless old books in the jar.

He tore some up to divide them among the other camel drivers who were present, which explains some of the damage and loss that does not fit the pattern of what one would expect from the gradual deterioration of the centuries. Since the other camel drivers, no doubt out of fear of Muḥammad ʿAlī, declined his insincere offer to share, he stacked it all back up together, unrolled the turban from around his head, put the codices in it, slung it over his shoulder, unhobbled his camel, drove back home, and dumped the junk in

⁹ For more detailed presentations see my "Introduction" in Marvin W. Meyer and James M. Robinson eds., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, translated by members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (Leiden: Brill, 1977); "The Discovery of the Nag Hammadi Codices," *BA* 42 (Fall 1979): 206-24; unabridged with footnotes as "From the Cliff to Cairo: The Story of the Discoverers and the Middlemen of the Nag Hammadi Codices," in *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi* (Québec, 22-25 août 1978), Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, ed. B. Barc, Section "Etudes" 1 (Québec: Les presses de l'Université Laval, 1981 [1982]), 21-58; "The Discovering and Marketing of Coptic Manuscripts: The Nag Hammadi Codices and the Bodmer Papyri," in *Sundries in honour of Torgny Säve-Söderbergh*, Acta Universitatis Uppsaliensis; Boreas: Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations 13 (Uppsala: University of Uppsala Press, 1984), 97-114, reprinted in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, Studies in Antiquity and Christianity, eds. B.A. Pearson and J.E. Goehring (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 1-25.

the enclosed patio of his house where the animals and their fodder were kept. His mother confirmed to me that she had in fact burnt some along with straw as kindling in the outdoor clay oven.

The family tried to sell the books for an Egyptian Pound or so, but nobody was willing to give money. Some were bartered for cigarettes or oranges. A Copt told Muḥammad ‘Alī they were books of the church, which probably meant only that the Copt could read enough to know they were not written in Arabic but in Coptic, which is more than could be said for Muḥammad ‘Alī. Since the police were repeatedly searching his home for incriminating evidence of the blood-vengeance murder, he deposited one book—Codex III—with a Coptic priest, knowing that house would not be searched. For the British had made clear to the Muslim police not to give the Copts too hard a time, for fear of inciting incidents between Copts and Muslims.

The priest gave the codex to his brother-in-law, a circuit-riding teacher of History and English in the parochial Coptic schools (the only schools in the region prior to President Nasser), who once a week stayed overnight at the priest’s home the day he taught at al-Qaṣr. This parochial school teacher was named, as you already know, Rāghib Andarāwus “al-Qiss” ‘Abd al-Sayyid. At the end of the summer of 1946, he took Codex III to Cairo to sell. Instead, when he showed it to an educated Copt, Georgy “Bei” Sobhy, to learn its value, he was, much to his horror, turned in to the authorities. He felt lucky to be permitted finally to sell his book to the Coptic Museum (for £E 300, from which a “gift” to the Museum of £E 50 was deducted) and return home without being put in prison.

The Director of the Coptic Museum, Togo Mina, had been a classmate in Paris of Jean and Marianne Doresse, in fact had proposed (unsuccessfully) to Marianne before she married Jean. He welcomed them to the Coptic Museum on their first visit to Cairo in the fall of 1947, proudly showed them Codex III, and offered to co-publish with Doresse (though Mina had shown it on December 5, 1946 to François Daumas, and offered to co-publish it with

him). Mina also took Doresse to an antique shop in Cairo owned by Albert Eid to see some 40 leaves of a similar codex—Codex I—which was later smuggled out of Egypt and taken as far as Ann Arbor, Michigan, in an effort to sell it. Finally it was bought by the Jung Institute in Zürich for \$8,000 contributed by an American expatriate, George H. (Tony) Page, and hence is known as the Jung Codex.¹⁰

Most of the codices were acquired ultimately by Phocion J. Tanos, a well-known Cypriot antiquities dealer in Cairo. He was pressured into entrusting them for safe-keeping to the government, which ultimately nationalized them instead, and deposited them in the Coptic Museum. The long drawn-out but ultimately unsuccessful legal proceedings that Tanos undertook to recuperate his property made the bulk of the codices inaccessible throughout the 1950s.

When Mina, the French-educated Director of the Coptic Museum, died prematurely in 1949, he was succeeded by the German-educated Director Pahor Labib. Then the Egyptian revolution in 1952 led to the expulsion of the French Director of the *Services des Antiquités*, Abbé Etienne Drioton, under whom Mina had studied in Paris. Finally, the Suez Crisis of 1956 resulted in a complete break in diplomatic relations between France and Egypt. All the French had left to show for their efforts was an International Committee dominated by Doresse's professor Henri-Charles Puech (who by now had cut Doresse himself out). The Committee had been convened in Cairo just before the Suez crisis, but achieved no more than award publication rights for *The Gospel of Thomas* to itself. Official minutes of that meeting were never made available to the Committee members, and hence no written publication rights were actually available. The Committee was never reconvened.

When Coptologists from former East Germany, not compromised in the Suez Crisis, began to visit Cairo in 1958, they were welcomed by the new Director of the Coptic Museum, Labib, who awarded them choice publication rights.

¹⁰ For the details, see my review article, "The Jung Codex: The Rise and Fall of a Monopoly," *RelSRev* (1977): 17-30.

They then returned to West Germany! Martin Krause and Pahor Labib published the three copies of the *Apocryphon of John* in 1963,¹¹ while Alexander Böhlig and Labib published *On the Origin of the World* in 1962¹² and the four *Apocalypses* of Codex V in 1963.¹³ Their colleagues still in East Germany, Hans-Martin Schenke and Peter Nagel, and of course all others, were cut out.

A poignant anecdote illustrates the oddity and injustice of the situation: The greatest living Coptologist of the time, Hans Jakob Polotsky, originally of Berlin, but by then of Jerusalem, expressed his amazement that, after his European colleagues had consistently denied him access to the new discovery, the texts should suddenly be offered to him by students from an unknown Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in California, of all places, who had come to Ann Arbor to study Coptic with him at a summer school in 1967.

Meanwhile the French had long-since counter-attacked, already in 1961 by enlisting the Paris-based UNESCO to internationalize the project. At the suggestion of its scholarly advisors, who were of course French, the UNESCO officials proposed to photograph all the material, bring it to Paris (which, after all, was where UNESCO was located), and convene in 1962 an International Committee to publish it by the end of 1964. But it soon became clear that the Coptic Museum, with Krause's help, had already assigned the unpublished plumbs to Krause and Böhlig. For a preliminary committee consisting of Pahor Labib, President; Martin Krause; and Michel Malinine,

¹¹ *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, 1 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962 [1963]).

¹² *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus dem Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, 58 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

¹³ *Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, Sonderband of the Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität (Halle-Wittenberg: Martin-Luther Universität, 1963).

met in Cairo and submitted on November 4, 1961 a report, based on Krause's inventory, proposing that UNESCO assign only twenty-three of the forty-eight tractates, on the grounds the others had already been assigned, were in the press, or had already appeared.

Those listed as already published were I,3 (published 1956); II,1 III,1, IV,1 (actually published, by Krause and Labib, only in 1963); II,2 (published 1959); II,5 (actually published, by Böhlig and Labib, in 1962); and II,6-7 (actually published, by Krause and Labib, in 1972). Two items already in the public domain, since in Labib's volume of facsimiles of 1956, were listed as assigned to the scholarly world outside of West Germany: II,3 to J. Martin Plumley of England and II,4 to the American Kendrick Grobel (who apparently was never informed of his assignment).

After consultation with Puech and Antoine Guillaumont, the relevant UNESCO official queried: "This seems to me very serious; if a large part of the treatises, and perhaps the richest, are already in the process of publication, is the creation of an International Committee of Publication really justified?" In response to a UNESCO request for an informed assessment, Guillaumont replied on December 4, 1961:

I admit that reading this report causes me some surprise and reveals to me a situation very different from what was presupposed in our previous correspondence relative to the Committee envisaged for the publication of the texts of Nag Hammadi. ...

I note, furthermore, that the treatises presented as already published or to be published by persons already designated are undoubtedly those that have the most interest and that give to the Nag Hammadi discovery its exceptional importance. Only those are left to be distributed by the Committee that offer the least interest and those whose publication, in view of their poor state or their fragmentary condition, will be especially thankless.

Upon the invitation addressed to me last July 4 by the Director General of UNESCO, I agreed quite gladly to become part of a Committee whose stated objective was the publication of the whole of the Nag Hammadi texts; it was, moreover, stated that this Committee would have for its task, at its first meeting, to work out the plan of the publication and to divide the work among the competent specialists. Now it seems to me evident that, in the conditions defined by the report, the Committee is from now on dispossessed of this essential antecedent task, for the major and most important part of the Nag Hammadi texts. If its role must be limited to covering with its authority a work organized without it and accomplished outside of its effective control, I for my part think that it no longer has any *raison d'être*.

UNESCO decided to limit itself to a facsimile edition, whose photography it was willing to fund. The French, now that the West Germans had gotten the remaining plumbs, lost interest. After all, the French had gotten control of the initial plumb they had detected while France still held the monopoly, *The Gospel of Thomas* (II,2), and also had control of the Jung Codex (Codex I) in Zürich, which was all they could manage to edit for years to come.

During a sabbatical year as Annual Professor at the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem in 1965-66, I went in all innocence to Cairo to find out the status of the Nag Hammadi Codices, first in March 1966, and again in April, on the way to the Congress on The Origins of Gnosticism at Messina, Sicily. The meager information I had obtained in Cairo made me into an instant authority on such matters at the Congress. So I was appointed to a committee to compose a telegram to UNESCO endorsed by the Congress, urging UNESCO to complete the languishing photography. On passing through Paris shortly thereafter, I inquired if the telegram had been received and acted upon. I was told that the last 314 photographs had indeed arrived in Paris on June 6, 1966. And I was assured that publication would be completed by the end of 1968. I was of course pleased with such good news,

but in more cynical retrospect realize that the publication timetable was at best wishful thinking, if not just an effective way to get me out of the office.

The German Archaeological Institute in Cairo had on my April trip given me access to Nag Hammadi photographs on file there, and I had worked twenty-four hours a day for a couple of days copying them. Then in June, I passed through Münster, Germany, to give a guest lecture at the University. In the process, I was lent some transcriptions by Krause, which I stayed up all night copying the night before my German lecture. On my return home, I obtained a modest NEH grant for three years, 1967-70, that made it possible to organize a small team to translate the few unpublished tractates to which I had by such unorthodox means obtained access. Each we stamped with a note to the effect that they should not be published, since we had no publication rights to offer. But we did circulate them widely in mimeographed form.

During the three-year grant period, I wrote repeatedly to UNESCO, letters that all went unanswered. The official in charge of the Nag Hammadi matter, N. Bammate, was a member of a gourmet dining club in Paris, but otherwise was quite inactive. When I complained to his superior, I was told that he did not answer letters, since he came from an oral culture (Afghanistan).

So I went back to Paris in January, 1968, to ask Bammate personally where things stood, for example, whether the fragments had been identified and placed on the leaves before photography, a prerequisite to using the UNESCO photographs for a facsimile edition that would put the material into the public domain available to all. Rather than bother with shuffling through the photographs to seek to answer my question, he said I could study them myself and write a report to him as to the status of the fragments. He even let me use a UNESCO office empty over the weekend for this purpose. He laid out for me about half of the glossy prints, and the negatives of the other half, no doubt so I could not abscond with a complete file of prints.

Saturday morning, I found a photography shop in a Paris suburb willing to work straight through the weekend, and gave them some 600 negatives to make glossy-print enlargements in time enough for me to pick them and the negatives up by Sunday evening. Meanwhile in the UNESCO office, I laid the glossy prints one by one on the floor under my tripod and clicked away with my simple tourist's camera. Monday morning I turned in to Bammate the negatives and prints that he had lent me.

I also flew to Copenhagen and obtained from Søren Giversen microfilms he earlier had made in Cairo of Codices II, III and IX, which he however had not made available to others, on the grounds that Labib did not want the French to get them.

On returning to Claremont, I wrote the desired report and sent it to UNESCO. I now had photographs of all the Nag Hammadi codices.

We enlarged our American Nag Hammadi Project membership, ultimately to include some 38 persons. We assigned out all the Nag Hammadi tractates, and had produced draft transcriptions and translations of everything by 1970. This is what in effect broke the monopoly, in that we distributed widely our transcriptions and translations to the Nag Hammadi scholars who had been left out in the cold:

At the meeting of the Society for New Testament Studies in 1969 in England, I co-chaired with R. McLaughlin Wilson a Nag Hammadi Seminar, to which I invited Henry Chadwick of Oxford, who had edited the Greek *Sentences of Sextus*, to discuss the Coptic translation in Codex XII that Frederik Wisse had just identified, and Böhlig of Tübingen to analyze the *Paraphrase of Shem* in Codex VII, both on the basis of the transcriptions and translations we had sent them.

I sent our transcriptions and translations to Kurt Rudolph of Leipzig in East Germany. His report about their contents, which he somewhat naively

published in 1969,¹⁴ motivated the head of the French monopoly, Henri-Charles Puech of the Ecole pratique des Hautes Etudes and the Collège de France, to make a formal protest to UNESCO for having given me access to its photographs. Fortunately UNESCO told him that it was their responsibility to disseminate the cultures of its member states, not to restrict access. So they did not restrict my activity.

During the school year 1970-71, I lived in Paris but commuted once a week to Strasbourg as a Fulbright Professor at the University of Strasbourg. Each week, I gave a Nag Hammadi colleague, Jacques Ménard, our transcription and translation of a tractate, and the next week discussed it privately with him, while passing on to him another tractate for discussion the following week.

By such means we saw to it that all interested scholars got access to the material. But we still lacked publication rights.

2. The Second Half of the Fifty Years: The Publishing of All the Nag Hammadi Codices from 1970 to 1995

We have already reached the half-way mark in the fifty years since the discovery, but the material was still not published and accessible to scholarship at large. In the first half of our fifty-year span only about a third of the discovery had been published. Only a fifth was available in English translation, no doubt because there had been no English monopoly. The history of a Nag Hammadi scholarship fully open to the whole academic community really only began in 1970.

¹⁴ Kurt Rudolph, "Gnosis und Gnostizismus, ein Forschungsbericht," *TRu* n. F. 34 (1969): 89-120, 181-231, 358-361. The third installment, with the subtitle "Nachträge," consists primarily of corrections I had sent him after reading proofs of the first two installments. He speaks quite openly, e.g. p. 359, of "the ongoing work of the editing team in Claremont (USA)" under my leadership.

During my sabbatical year 1970-71 in Paris, I worked in an office lent to me at UNESCO. At my urging, an "International Committee for the Nag Hammadi Codices" was not only nominated by UNESCO and appointed by the Arab Republic of Egypt, but even actually convened in Cairo in December 1970. Since I had long before arranged with Brill to publish the facsimile edition, Brill had made a plane reservation for their Dutch photographer to fly to Cairo and photograph the material as we restored it, if I could get the Committee to accept Brill (rather than some Egyptian firm) as publisher. I finally broke through the pomp and ceremony of the opening day of the Cairo meeting to get that much of the agenda acted on and a telegram off to Brill. This timing was crucial, for Brill's plane reservation was for the next day, and, due to the Christmas tourism, there were no plane seats left on later flights.

I proposed a Technical Sub-Committee stay in Cairo after the formal meeting ended to reassemble the fragmentary leaves, so that a facsimile edition would be possible. I nominated for membership in the Technical Sub-Committee those who had long since had access to the material, and hence had some experience in working at least with photographs: the German delegate Martin Krause, the Swiss delegate Rodolphe Kasser, the Danish delegate Søren Giversen, and myself, the American delegate and Permanent Secretary of the UNESCO Committee.

We worked some ten days, and again a fortnight in January, using as our point of departure the mimeographed transcriptions and translations the American team had prepared. Not only each day's results of reassembled leaves, but in fact all the Nag Hammadi materials, were photographed by the Brill photographer, so that complete photographic files came to Leiden and Claremont. But the job of placing fragments and establishing the sequence of leaves in each codex was far from complete. We returned once a year for a week or two as long as UNESCO would pay for the trips. But very many fragments still remained unplaced. I then took two of my students, Charles W. Hedrick and Stephen L. Emmel, for a semester to Cairo in 1974-75, and

then left Emmel there for two more years to carry through the last fragment placements until the conservation project was really completed. The Institute paid Emmel \$100 per month for living expenses in Cairo during that period.

The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices began publication in the Spring of 1972 with the appearance of *Codex VI*, less than a year and a half after we first got access in Cairo to the papyri themselves. The publication of the last of the thirteen codices, in two volumes of the *Facsimile Edition* containing *Codex I* and *Codices IX and X*, took place in 1977, in time to be announced in December in a plenary address at the SBL Annual Meeting in San Francisco.

To meet that deadline, we had an all-too-tight schedule: The last fragment had been placed on September 2 by Emmel in Cairo. This placement got the stamp of approval from our volume editor for the critical edition of the relevant codex, Birger A. Pearson, on September 30. Our placement was then phoned through to Frederik Wisse (whom we had, with Böhlig's help, stationed in Tübingen to work closely with the facsimile edition's printing firm in Stuttgart). He added a photo of the new fragment into the photograph of the correct leaf, which was then forwarded to Leiden in time to be bound and hand-carried to the SBL convention in December by the Director of Brill, W.C. Wieder, Jr. This meant that eight years after getting access to the originals in Cairo all thirteen codices had been put into the public domain. Hence we simultaneously published in December 1977 *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*,¹⁵ our already-prepared English translation. Since then, it has appeared in three editions and become something of a best seller, over 100,000 copies.

¹⁵ Marvin W. Meyer and James M. Robinson eds., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, translated by members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (Leiden: Brill, 1977); paperback edition 1984; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1977, paperback edition 1981); third, completely revised edition, Richard Smith and James M. Robinson eds. (San Francisco: Harper & Row and Brill: 1988; paperback edition (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1990).

A German New Testament scholar of distinction, Gerd Lüdemann of the University of Göttingen, has in a just-published book put in perspective this event at the 1977 SBL.¹⁶

It was a truly historical moment when at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in San Francisco in December 1977 this pioneer act of North American biblical scholarship was turned over to the public. By this it became symbolically clear that the former dominance of German exegesis had once for all found its end.

Meanwhile our fourteen-volume critical edition, with introductions to each tractate, followed by transcripts, translations, notes and indices, had already begun to appear in 1975 with *The Gospel of the Egyptians* by Alexander Böhlig and Frederik Wisse.¹⁷ The last two volumes, *The Apocryphon of John* by Frederik Wisse and Michael Waldstein,¹⁸ and *Codex VII*, edited by Birger A. Pearson,¹⁹ have both just appeared, to make this 1995 Annual Meeting of SBL not only the fiftieth anniversary of the Nag Hammadi discovery but also the celebration of the completion of the critical edition of all the Nag Hammadi texts.

Our translation team consisted in many cases of the same Americans who went with me to Cairo year after year to place fragments for the facsimile edition and who at the same time were preparing our critical edition. They

¹⁶ *Ketzer: Die andere Seite des frühen Christentums* (Stuttgart: Radius, 1995), 232, n. 9.

¹⁷ *Nag Hammadi Codices III,2 and IV,2: The Gospel of the Egyptians (The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit)*, edited with translation and commentary by Alexander Böhlig and Frederik Wisse in cooperation with Pahor Labib, NHS, eds. M. Krause et al., IV, *The Coptic Gnostic Library*, ed. J.M. Robinson (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

¹⁸ *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1 and IV,1, with BG 8502,2*, edited by Frederik Wisse and Michael Waldstein, *Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies*, eds. J.M. Robinson and H.-J. Klimkeit, 33, *The Coptic Gnostic Library*, ed. J.M. Robinson (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

¹⁹ *Nag Hammadi Codex VII*, edited by Birger A. Pearson, *Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies*, eds. J.M. Robinson and H.-J. Klimkeit, 30, *The Coptic Gnostic Library*, ed. J.M. Robinson (Leiden: Brill, 1996 [actually November 1995]).

continue to be prominent in the Nag Hammadi Section of SBL created at about that time. Two have become Project Directors at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, Birger A. Pearson and Marvin W. Meyer, directing projects that grew out of our Nag Hammadi experience. Several are members of the recently reorganized Brill monograph series, Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies, whose original Editorial Board had only a small minority of Americans (Hans Jonas, George MacRae, Frederik Wisse and myself), but whose reorganized board has now a majority (Harold W. Attridge, Ron Cameron, Stephen L. Emmel, Charles W. Hedrick, Howard M. Jackson, Douglas M. Parrott, Birger A. Pearson and myself). This team has thus matured to give American scholarship an international prominence in Coptology and Gnosticism it never had before.

The copies of our original draft transcriptions and translations given to Jacques Ménard in Strasbourg in 1970-71 became the basis for the French-Canadian critical edition with commentary, directed by Paul-Hubert Poirier at the University of Laval in Quebec, *La bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi*. It began publication in 1977 at Peeters in Leuven and promises to complete its many-volumed edition before the end of the decade.

The *Berliner Arbeitskreis für koptisch-gnostische Schriften*, led by Hans-Martin Schenke, had obtained on loan the transcriptions and translations I had given to Kurt Rudolph, photographed them, and used this for the source material of their own translation activity. For they had already begun as early as 1958 publishing in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*²⁰ translations of the few tractates that were already available in the meager volume of facsimiles Pahor Labib had published in Egypt in 1956. With all the material now in hand, their tempo escalated dramatically, and translations were followed by critical editions with commentaries, as dissertations were published. This Berlin group, though now somewhat scattered among the three centers, from Claremont to Quebec and Berlin, is currently working on a complete and

²⁰ Johannes Leipoldt, "Ein neues Evangelium? Das koptische Thomasevangelium übersetzt und besprochen," *ThLZ* 83 (1958): 481-96.

definitive German translation to appear in the series *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte*, as volumes 2 and 3 of the sub-series *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften*.

It is of some cultural-political significance, in terms of the sociology of knowledge, that a manuscript discovery originally monopolized by Western Europe, namely France and West Germany, with Denmark, The Netherlands and Switzerland playing supporting roles, is no longer dominated by Western Europe. Instead, the outsiders, rather than competing among themselves, have banded together to produce the comprehensive and definitive editions in English, not in England but in America, in French, not in France but in Canada, and in German, not in what was West Germany but in what was East Germany. What used to be considered in this area of research the outer fringes of the Western world have thus joined together to become a united cooperative undertaking. The three teams, representing the three scholarly language areas, have tended to merge into what has become the main strength of Nag Hammadi research in the world today. It is appropriately symbolic that the leaders of all three teams have planned to be here together to share in this celebration.

The coming of age of North American scholarship in this field can be illustrated by a cameo portrait of one of our members. I mentioned having taken two students with me to Cairo for seven months in 1974-75 to finish placing the many fragments that the Technical Sub-Committee of UNESCO's committee had not been able to place. One of them was Stephen L. Emmel. He had just begun Graduate School at Claremont, but gladly dropped out so as to be able to go along to Cairo and stay there a couple more years to finish up the job. He then went to Yale for his doctorate with one of our team members, Bentley Layton, who had become America's leading Coptologist. Emmel is currently President Elect of the International Association for Coptic Studies, the kind of honor never before awarded to an American graduate student. By the way, he did get his doctorate, with a dissertation that is a *magnum opus* in its own right, making sense, in terms of an ancient

organization of Shenoute's collected works, out of the chaos of thousands of leaves of Shenoute manuscripts from the White Monastery, scattered in museums and libraries throughout the Western world.²¹

But that is not all! Emmel, that home-town boy from Rochester, NY, has just accepted the Chair of Coptology at the University of Münster, Germany, upon the retirement of Martin Krause. When our team first started as unknown beginners, we tried to commend ourselves to the establishment, by conforming to their editing procedures. After all, Krause more than anyone else had the inside track at the Coptic Museum, where he had worked for years and acquired his own photographs and transcriptions. For Emmel now to become his successor in the only chair of Coptology in Germany, in fact in the world, is of course first of all a personal achievement for a really brilliant young scholar. But it also marks the coming of age of American scholarship in this field. One need merely compare the first critical editions of the Apocryphon of John²² with the just-published critical edition in our Brill series,²³ a really superb achievement, to see the scholarly advance that has been made over the past generation.

3. The New Ethos for Handling Manuscript Discoveries

The publication of the complete *Facsimile Edition*, just eight years after first getting access to the papyri themselves, has set an obvious standard for avoiding or overcoming monopolies in other manuscript discoveries. After all, we, though outsiders to the field, had shown that where there is a will there is a way. For the impossibilities ticked off by the insiders usually turned out to

²¹ See his "Shenoute's Literary Corpus" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1993).

²² Martin Krause and Pahor Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes*; Søren Giversen, *Apocryphon Johannis: The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction and Commentary*, Acta Theologica Danica 5 (Copenhagen: Prostant apud Munksgaard, 1963).

²³ Frederik Wisse and Michael Waldstein, *The Apocryphon of John*.

be excuses to justify their own self-interest, excuses that could readily be overcome if one really wanted to.

For example: The last bit of the Nag Hammadi monopoly had been the Jung Codex, Codex I, since it was not in Cairo, where we had achieved open access, but in a bank vault in Zürich belonging to the heirs of Carl Gustaf Jung. The heirs were the owners, but had agreed to return the codex to Cairo when the team of editors no longer needed it for their transcription. The spokesman for the editors, Rodolphe Kasser, was on our Technical Sub-Committee, and would still have unlimited access to it in Cairo, had it been returned. But then so could the rest of us! So he maintained that the heirs were not willing to return it because they knew it was worth a lot of money. But then the spokesman for the heirs told me the Jung family was ready to return it whenever the editors said they no longer needed it in Zürich. He even agreed to write the editors to inquire if he could return it. Thereupon he informed me that all who had responded (a postal strike had prevented the French from responding) had agreed to return it, except ... Rodolphe Kasser! Only when Kasser had sent the last volume of their edition to the publisher and thus insured that it would be the *editio princeps* did he agree to the return of the codex to Egypt.²⁴

The most obvious comparison to the Nag Hammadi publication experience has been with the Dead Sea Scrolls, since both discoveries took place at about the same time and hence have all along been compared in various regards.

In the Fall 1979 issue of the *Biblical Archaeologist*, devoted exclusively to the Nag Hammadi discovery, Harry Thomas Frank, the editor of that issue, included a "Letter to the Readers" in which he forcefully pressed home the invidious comparison with Qumran. And various Qumran scholars, from David Noel Friedman (University of Michigan) to Stanislav Siegart (UCLA)

²⁴ See my "The Jung Codex: The Rise and Fall of a Monopoly."

to Zwi Verblovsky (Hebrew University), have appealed to me over the years to direct my energies to breaking the monopoly on the Dead Sea Scrolls. But I steadfastly declined the honor and privilege, and impossible chore, since, after all, that is not my field of competence. But then I was trapped into it by an odd kind of serendipity:

Hershel Shanks, who led the campaign to break the Qumran monopoly, mentioned with irony in his *Biblical Archeology Review* in 1989:²⁵

At least two sets of photographs of all Dead Sea Scroll texts—both published and unpublished—have been deposited in the United States for security reasons. But the agreements with the depositories—the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in Claremont, California, and Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati—forbid their giving access to outside scholars.

I telephoned Shanks to correct his statement, by explaining that the photographs are not at the Institute but at our sister institution in Claremont, the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center. Subsequently, Shanks made the correction.²⁶

Professor Robinson says he is as much an outsider as anyone. Were the Dead Sea texts under his jurisdiction, he would feel “morally obligated” to see that they were made available, as he did with the Nag Hammadi codices of which he was chief editor.

A few months later, Robert Eisenman of Long Beach State University invited me to participate in a day-long program he had scheduled there for April 28,

²⁵ “New Hope for the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls,” *BAR* XV/6 (November-December 1989): 56.

²⁶ “Correction: Photographs of Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls at Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center,” *BAR* XVI/1 (January-February 1990): 67.

was due to appear simultaneously with our edition. His article, based on a telephone interview with me, was entitled "How to Break a Scholarly Monopoly: The Case of the Gospel of Thomas." Here he pointed out that Pahor Labib's very inadequate Egyptian facsimile edition of a few Nag Hammadi tractates including *The Gospel of Thomas*, published in 1956, led promptly to a flood of translations, into Latin, German, French, Danish, English and Swedish, which left the International Committee of 1956 that had held the monopoly no choice but to publish a "preliminary" excerpt of their *editio maior* in 1959, which is all they ever published.³⁰

Even they did not have official authorization for what they did publish. For they had refused to put Pahor Labib's name on the title page along side their own names as editors, in view of the fact that he had not actually been involved in the editing process. Labib then never signed the authorization for them to publish an official edition. Brill ultimately had to fall back on the same legitimacy the flood of competing translations had used. Labib's facsimile edition, if nothing else, had, after all, put the text in the public domain. Presumably we would still be waiting for their *editio maior* as the *editio princeps* of *The Gospel of Thomas*, had not Labib's little volume of facsimiles forced their hand! The moral of Shanks' article was that a facsimile edition, even a very inadequate one, can break a monopoly. That is all I hoped for, in the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls. After all, without access to the fragments themselves, we had to publish the photographs as they were.

Our two-volume *Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* appeared in record time. The contract had been signed only on September 12, 1991, and, less than ten weeks later, our edition was presented at a press conference in New York on November 19, 1991, just a few days before the SBL Annual Meeting in Kansas City.

XVI/6 (November–December 1990): 55.

³⁰ Antoine Guillaumont et al. eds., *The Gospel according to Thomas: Coptic Text Established and Translated* (Leiden: Brill, 1959); Dutch, French and German editions appeared simultaneously.

to Zwi Verblovsky (Hebrew University), have appealed to me over the years to direct my energies to breaking the monopoly on the Dead Sea Scrolls. But I steadfastly declined the honor and privilege, and impossible chore, since, after all, that is not my field of competence. But then I was trapped into it by an odd kind of serendipity:

Hershel Shanks, who led the campaign to break the Qumran monopoly, mentioned with irony in his *Biblical Archeology Review* in 1989:²⁵

At least two sets of photographs of all Dead Sea Scroll texts—both published and unpublished—have been deposited in the United States for security reasons. But the agreements with the depositories—the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in Claremont, California, and Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati—forbid their giving access to outside scholars.

I telephoned Shanks to correct his statement, by explaining that the photographs are not at the Institute but at our sister institution in Claremont, the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center. Subsequently, Shanks made the correction:²⁶

Professor Robinson says he is as much an outsider as anyone. Were the Dead Sea texts under his jurisdiction, he would feel “morally obligated” to see that they were made available, as he did with the Nag Hammadi codices of which he was chief editor.

A few months later, Robert Eisenman of Long Beach State University invited me to participate in a day-long program he had scheduled there for April 28,

²⁵ “New Hope for the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls,” *BAR* XV/6 (November-December 1989): 56.

²⁶ “Correction: Photographs of Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls at Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center,” *BAR* XVI/1 (January-February 1990): 67.

1990, on "Scrolls, Caves, and Hidden Manuscripts." He asked me to narrate how breaking a monopoly was done in the case of the Nag Hammadi texts.

Shortly thereafter, Eisenman visited me in Claremont. First he extricated from me a promise of the strictest confidentiality, which I honored, in spite of various awkward situations, for which I here apologize. He then broadly hinted that he had some photographs of unpublished Qumran material. On his next visit he conceded he had photographs of all the unpublished fragments, and asked if I might use my know-how in publishing facsimile editions and my good offices with my publisher Brill to publish together with him a facsimile edition of the unpublished Qumran fragments.

Thereupon I talked to the Brill representative at the SBL International Meeting in Vienna, Austria, in August 1990. We agreed to meet at the Annual Meeting in New Orleans that November to work out a publication agreement. Before going ahead, I had lunch with my friend Frank Cross, to see if there really was any need for me to get involved at all. In New Orleans, Eisenman and I agreed to supply Brill with the front matter and the edited photographs by February, 1991. Brill agreed to produce a microfiche edition by the beginning of May. A formal contract with the Brill administration was signed on February 15-16, 1991.

I spent the Christmas semester break of 1990-91 writing the Introduction and Index, and labeling the thousands of glossy prints that Eisenman lent to me, only a part at a time (lest I abscond with the whole), to choose the best of each of his several prints from each negative. Eisenman never told me what his connection in Israel was that had made it possible for him to get a copy of the negatives.

Our co-signed Introduction was particularly delicate, since my two conditions for participating were that the Introduction include no suggestion of criticism or polemic, and that Eisenman's views on Qumran, which I do not share, not be mentioned. I completed my chores in time for Eisenman to

air-freight everything to Brill on time. The microfiche masters were produced in The Netherlands, and presumably are still in Leiden.

But just a month before our publication date of May 3, 1992, Brill sent a staff member, Hans van der Meij, to a Qumran meeting at Salamanca, Spain, where he witnessed the overpowering pressure put by the monopolists on the isolated Polish Qumran scholar Zdzislaw J. Kapera, to withdraw his offer to supply interested scholars with copies of the transcription by John Strugnell and Elisha Qimron of 4Q MMT, a Qumran text that they had heralded as sensational but was still unpublished. Kapera crumbled.²⁷ On hearing of this fiasco, Brill thereupon on April 8, 1991 canceled our signed contract and withdrew, but later published, once the monopoly had been broken, an official microfiche edition edited by Emanuel Tov himself.²⁸

Eisenman and I sought another publisher. After several well-known houses would not touch the project with a ten-foot pole, we turned by the end of the summer to Shanks, who eagerly agreed to publish.

Without actually letting the cat out of the bag, Shanks published his rationale for our facsimile edition in the issue of the *Biblical Archaeology Review*²⁹ which

²⁷ The offer had been made by Zdzislaw J. Kapera, "An Anonymously Received Pre-Publication of the 4 Q MMT," *The Qumran Chronicle* 2 (December 1990). The transcription itself was available as "Appendix 'A'." On March 12, 1991 General Amir Drori, at the request of Qimron, had written to Kapera, with a copy to the President of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Cracow Section, expressing "astonishment" at Kapera's offer. He had called on Kapera to "cancel your plans" and demanded an "immediate reply." At the congress in Salamanca Kapera apologized to Qimron in the presence of Eugene Ulrich and Emanuel Tov (two of the troika that had succeeded John Strugnell as head of the Dead Sea Scroll cartel). On his return to Poland Kapera wrote on April 10, 1991 to General Drori assuming full responsibility. He said he was "a frustrated scholar who had been awaiting publication of the text 'soon' since April 1984 (not to say since 1952!)." He quoted a statement by Strugnell and Qimron published in 1985 that "a preliminary edition of the whole document will be finished within a year or so."

²⁸ *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche: A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert*, published under the auspices of the Israel Antiquities Authority, ed. E. Tov (Leiden: Brill and IDC Microform Publishers, 1993).

²⁹ "How to Break a Scholarly Monopoly: The Case of the Gospel of Thomas," *BAR*

was due to appear simultaneously with our edition. His article, based on a telephone interview with me, was entitled "How to Break a Scholarly Monopoly: The Case of the Gospel of Thomas." Here he pointed out that Pahor Labib's very inadequate Egyptian facsimile edition of a few Nag Hammadi tractates including *The Gospel of Thomas*, published in 1956, led promptly to a flood of translations, into Latin, German, French, Danish, English and Swedish, which left the International Committee of 1956 that had held the monopoly no choice but to publish a "preliminary" excerpt of their *editio maior* in 1959, which is all they ever published.³⁰

Even they did not have official authorization for what they did publish. For they had refused to put Pahor Labib's name on the title page along side their own names as editors, in view of the fact that he had not actually been involved in the editing process. Labib then never signed the authorization for them to publish an official edition. Brill ultimately had to fall back on the same legitimacy the flood of competing translations had used. Labib's facsimile edition, if nothing else, had, after all, put the text in the public domain. Presumably we would still be waiting for their *editio maior* as the *editio princeps* of *The Gospel of Thomas*, had not Labib's little volume of facsimiles forced their hand! The moral of Shanks' article was that a facsimile edition, even a very inadequate one, can break a monopoly. That is all I hoped for, in the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls. After all, without access to the fragments themselves, we had to publish the photographs as they were.

Our two-volume *Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls* appeared in record time. The contract had been signed only on September 12, 1991, and, less than ten weeks later, our edition was presented at a press conference in New York on November 19, 1991, just a few days before the SBL Annual Meeting in Kansas City.

XVI/6 (November–December 1990): 55.

³⁰ Antoine Guillaumont et al. eds., *The Gospel according to Thomas: Coptic Text Established and Translated* (Leiden: Brill, 1959); Dutch, French and German editions appeared simultaneously.

Shanks had not mentioned in our contract that he himself would insert his own Publisher's Foreword, including, in addition to a massive polemic, the transcription of 4 Q MMT! Last-minute written efforts were undertaken by the President of The Claremont University Center, John D. Maguire,³¹ and by the then Chair of the Advisory Board of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, J. Harold Ellens,³² to dissuade Shanks, but all to no avail.

Qimron sued for some \$200,000 in damages for publishing his scholarship, the transcription of 4Q MMT. An Israeli court compelled Shanks to publish a second edition without the incriminating transcription of 4Q MMT, much to my relief. This legal procedure, incidentally, did not question in any way our right to publish the photographs themselves, which indicates that our Brill contract could have been honored without adverse legal consequences.

The urgency within the scholarly and lay public to bring the monopoly on the Dead Sea Scrolls to an end was documented by the fact that, unknown to me, two other efforts were underway at the same time to achieve the same goal. Ben Zion Wacholder and his computer-wise doctoral student Martin G. Abegg at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati (where microfilms of the unpublished fragments were also on file, but equally inaccessible) had the ingenious idea of taking the card file of Qumran vocabulary that had been produced a generation ago to help the editors, each card with a swath of text

³¹ Maguire's letter of November 20, 1991 stated: "We do however have a major concern regarding the volumes as hand-bound and presented at the news conference—the inclusion of the lengthy and polemical foreword and its accompanying figures. Without exception, everyone at The Claremont Graduate School who has been apprised of the situation believes the foreword and figures should be removed from this historic work. ... The Claremont Graduate School feels strongly enough about this issue to agree to accept the cost of removing the inappropriate pages and repaginating where necessary. In the interest of retaining the enthusiastic support of the School in this project, we hope you will agree to the proposed changes."

³² Ellens' letter of November 20, 1991, which I hand-delivered to Shanks at the SBL Annual Meeting in Kansas City, read in part: "To leave those elements in the volumes released for scholarly and popular consumption cheapens the objective scholarly quality of the volumes and makes us subject to just such unnecessary and unjust criticism from those scholars who will wish to find reasons to demean what we have accomplished here."

around the indexed word—one could put them end-to-end, so to speak, and thus reconstruct unpublished texts. Their first fascicle was published by Shanks on September 4, 1991.³³

Meanwhile, on September 22, 1990, the Director of the Huntington Library, William A. Moffett, had announced that the negatives it had held in its vault for years were being made accessible to the scholarly public without any restrictions. He immediately—the same day—received a FAX from General Amir Drori, as Director, Israel Antiquities Authority, and Prof. Emanuel Tov, as Editor-in-Chief, The International Dead Sea Scrolls Project, urging him to reconsider and thus “save us the trouble of legal action.” Moffett did not reconsider, and there was no legal action.³⁴ The invincible monopoly was broken by a simple common-sense decision of a decisive administrator.

At the Annual Meeting of SBL at Kansas City that same year, just a week after our *Facsimile Edition* had appeared, SBL President Helmut Koester convened a special meeting of the society at 9 PM on the last evening, Nov. 25. The Chair of the Research and Publications Committee read a resolution that had just been officially adopted by SBL.³⁵

³³ Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four, Fascicle 1* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991).

³⁴ For the ethical issues involved, see my essay, “Ethics in Publishing Manuscript Discoveries: Panel Discussion,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects*, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 722, eds. M. O. Wise, et al. (New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 468-71.

³⁵ On November 22, 1991 the Research and Publications Committee had (to quote its minutes) “directed that the statement on access be sent to funding agencies, publishers, primary repositories, be published in RSN, and be circulated through the American Council of Learned Societies to other learned societies interested in literary and artifactual remains (encouraging their participation in policy development). The Committee approved further distribution as widely as possible.” I had it republished in the *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 92 (1992): 296.

1. *Recommendation to those who own or control ancient written materials:*

Those who own or control ancient written materials should allow all scholars to have access to them. If the condition of the written materials requires that access to them be restricted, arrangements should be made for a facsimile reproduction that will be accessible to all scholars. Although the owners or those in control may choose to authorize one scholar or preferably a team of scholars to prepare an official edition of any given ancient written materials, such authorization should neither preclude access to the written materials by other scholars nor hinder other scholars from publishing their own studies, translations, or editions of the written materials.

2. *Obligations entailed by specially authorized editions:* Scholars who are given special authorization to work on official editions of ancient written materials should cooperate with the owners or those in control of the written materials to ensure publication of the edition in an expeditious manner, and they should facilitate access to the written materials by all scholars. If the owners or those in control grant to specially authorized editors any privileges that are unavailable to other scholars, these privileges should by no means include exclusive access to the written materials or facsimile reproductions of them. Furthermore, the owners or those in control should set a reasonable deadline for completion of the envisioned edition (not more than five years after the special authorization is granted).

There Emanuel Tov himself announced that all restrictions on free access had been officially lifted.³⁶ You might as well unlock the barn, once the horse is stolen.

³⁶ As recently as October 1, 1995 Tov had reported by E-Mail to the "Judaicos: First Century Judaism Discussion Forum," denying rumors that they had "dropped their objection to the Huntington action" and affirmed that "all of us are still in the middle of deliberations." On October 6, 1991 he wrote the Huntington proposing a meeting to discuss the problem, and requested that the Huntington "delay all access to the scrolls for one month, until the said meeting." The meeting never took place.

I hope and trust, and in fact am convinced, that we have all learned a lesson from this sad tale, for which we all bear some collective responsibility, and that in the case of future important manuscript discoveries a much more enlightened policy will be followed.³⁷ The Nag Hammadi experience deserves some credit for provided positive incentives to such a better future, in helping to change the ethos for handling important new manuscript discoveries.

I have moved in my own research from Nag Hammadi studies into reconstructing a critical text of the Sayings Gospel Q. The biggest problem with Q is of course the lack of any manuscript evidence, which has created the standard criticism that Q is only a hypothetical text. I must say that the absence of any Q manuscripts to be caught up in some Q monopoly was for me a strong positive incentive! We have made the results of our International Q Project promptly available, publishing each year in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (the October issue) the preceding year's reconstructions, so that we in turn not be thought to be monopolizing the lost manuscript we are reconstructing. The final segment of our critical text of Q has just appeared.³⁸ We have already begun on a revised edition to appear in book form and on CD-ROM, which we hope will become a standard tool in our discipline. It should appear before the end of the decade.

³⁷ By pure coincidence I presented an address proposing such policies the same weekend that the Huntington Library made its announcement. It has hence been widely published: *Manuscript Discoveries of the Future* with an appendix, title page, table of contents, introduction and sample plates from: *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Occasional Papers, The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 23, ed. J.L. Reed, (Claremont: IAC, 1991); abridged by the author, "Avoiding Another Scrolls Access Furor," *Los Angeles Times*, September 28, 1991, Section F, 13-14; abridged by the editor, "Handling Future Manuscript Discoveries," *BA* (December 1991): 235-240; abridged by Hershel Shanks, "What We Should Do Next Time Great Manuscripts Are Discovered," *BAR* 18/1 (January-February 1992): 66-70; reprinted in unabridged form in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 92 (1992): 281-96.

³⁸ Milton C. Moreland and James M. Robinson, "The International Q Project Work Sessions 23-27 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994," *JBL* 114 (1995): 475-485. An addendum will appear in the October 1996 issue.

4. The Impact of the Nag Hammadi Discovery on the Shape of New Testament Scholarship

Here it is not my purpose to itemize a series of specific details where the Nag Hammadi texts have influenced the understanding of New Testament texts.³⁹ Rather my intent is to maintain the focus on the shape of the discipline of biblical scholarship itself as a result of the Nag Hammadi discovery.

The forty-eight Nag Hammadi tractates would have commended themselves to biblical scholarship much more readily if they had been discovered in Palestine or Syria, where many of them were composed, rather than in Upper Egypt, where none of them were composed, and if they had survived not only in late Fourth Century copies of Coptic translations, but also in the original Greek in which the authors wrote in the first three centuries of the Common Era. Hence they caught us academically unprepared. Coptic was at that time only one of the more esoteric dimensions of textual criticism, and had been safely ignored by all the rest of us. It can no longer be safely ignored.

Furthermore our traditional prejudices about Gnosticism had dampened the interest of many. But some of the Nag Hammadi tractates are not Gnostic at all! For example, *The Teachings of Silvanus* (VII,4) is Jewish wisdom literature (somewhat Christianized), indeed it quotes (112,37-113,7) the *Wisdom of Solomon* (7:25-26) as referring to Christ. Thus it involves a secondary Sophia Christology that broadens considerably the faint traces in the New Testament itself.

The bulk of the tractates are of course Gnostic, and that has been a stumbling-block for many. After all, Gnosticism has commonly been held to be unintelligible other-worldly and rather irrelevant mythology, a corruption of Primitive Christianity that abandoned the Old Testament and its God—our

³⁹ Hans-Martin Schenke, "The Relevance of Nag Hammadi Research to New Testament Scholarship" (a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Philadelphia, November 19, 1995).

God—in a Marcion-like perversion. Hence, rather than, with an open mind, seizing upon this library, the first really authentic early Gnostic texts that can speak for themselves, many in our discipline have simply left them to one side. Therefore it is very important to communicate to a wider academic public the surprising results that the specialists have thus far reached, which should lead to a calming of our prejudices.

Rather than being a departure from the Old Testament as the basis of our religious tradition, Gnosticism found there, rather than in Homer or Zoroaster⁴⁰ or Gilgamesh, the inspiration for its mythology. The book of Genesis is the favorite authority of Gnosticism! For example, Gen 3 is retold detail after detail, even if with a typically Gnostic twist, in *The Testimony of Truth* (IX,3). To be sure, the Gnostics did interpret the Old Testament in a different way, as did, however, also Philo, Josephus, the New Testament, Qumran and Rabbinic Judaism. Hence Gnosticism stands in the biblical tradition, as well.

In effect, the roots of Gnosticism, previously sought all over the ancient world, have become most visible in Judaism. Even the apocalyptic literature of Judaism itself has been enriched with one Jewish Gnostic apocalypse from Nag Hammadi, the *Apocalypse of Adam* (V,5). George MacRae saw to its inclusion in the current edition of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*.⁴¹ It narrates Adam's death-bed testament to his son Seth, a kind of Gnostic *Heilsgeschichte*, narrating the three descents of the Gnostic Redeemer, Seth, to rescue the elect Sethians from flood, fire, and the final cataclysm.

⁴⁰ The tractate *Zostrianos* (VIII,1) concluded with an encoded subscript: "Zostrianos; Oracles of Truth of Zostrianos, God of Truth; Teachings of Zoroaster." But the text is not Zoroastrian, but Sethian, building on 2 Enoch.

⁴¹ *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 1, *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, ed. by James H. Charlesworth (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 707-11 (MacRae's introduction), 712-19 (MacRae's translation).

Birger A. Pearson has summarized in his own Fiftieth Anniversary paper⁴² the dependence of Nag Hammadi texts on Jewish apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature: *The Apocryphon of John* (II,1; III,1; IV,1; BG 8502,2) builds on *1 Enoch*; *The Apocalypse of Adam* (V,5) builds on *The Life of Adam and Eve*; *Zostrianos* (VIII,1) builds on *2 Enoch*. Here one has before one's very eyes the source material of Gnosticism. All it took was the distinctive Gnostic twist, a powerful push from some kind of alienated Judaism, Samaritanism, or Proselytism, to engender the Gnostic movement.

A whole new Jewish sect, to add to the plethora already known to characterize Second Temple Judaism, has come into the clear light of day in the Nag Hammadi Codices. It is Hans-Martin Schenke who has brought into focus the Gnostic Sethians, who contributed the largest single cluster to the Nag Hammadi library, eleven of the forty-eight different texts. At the International Conference on The Rediscovery of Gnosticism held at Yale in 1978, one major section of the program, and one whole volume of its proceedings, were devoted exclusively to Sethianism.⁴³

The Nag Hammadi Sethian texts can be subdivided into three groups, making it possible to discern roughly the history of Sethianism.⁴⁴ Some are only Jewish, with no Christian aspects: *The Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), *The Thought of Norea* (IX,2), *Marsanes* (X), and *Allogenes* (XI,3), or at most with scant secondarily Christianizing interpolations: *The Apocalypse of Adam* (V,5) and

⁴² "From Jewish Apocalypticism to Gnosis," (a paper presented at the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Nag Hammadi Discovery: Copenhagen International Conference on the Nag Hammadi Texts in the History of Religions, September 19-24, 1995 at the Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters).

⁴³ *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28-31, 1978*, Vol. 2, *Sethian Gnosticism*, ed. B. Layton, Studies in the History of Religions 41, Supplements to *Numen* (Leiden: Brill, 1981). See especially Hans-Martin Schenke, "The Phenomenon and Significance of Gnostic Sethianism," 588-616, and also my contribution, "Sethians and Johannine Thought: The Trimorphic Protennoia and the Prologue of the Gospel of John," 643-662, as well as the "Discussion," 662-670, and the "Concluding Discussion," 671-685.

⁴⁴ See Schenke, "Gnosis: Zur Forschungsstand unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der religionsgeschichtlichen Problematik, VF 32 (1987): 2-21.

Zostrianos (VIII,1). Others have a thin Christian veneer: *The Gospel of the Egyptians* (III,2; IV,2) and *The Trimorphic Protennoia* (XIII,1). Only a minority can be really called Christian Gnosticism: *The Apocryphon of John* (II,1; III,1; IV,1; BG 8502,2), *The Hypostasis of the Archons* (II,4), and *Melchizedek* (IX,1). But this Christian Sethianism is the only kind previously known, since attested by the heresiologists.⁴⁵ The relative rarity of Christian Sethian texts in the Nag Hammadi library is all the more surprising, when one considers that it is after all a Christian library, which can of course account for the secondary Christianizing of several of the Jewish Sethian texts. Most of the non-Christian Jewish Sethian texts represent instead a Neo-Platonic Gnosticism, as especially John D. Turner has worked out: *The Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5), *Zostrianos* (VIII,1), *Marsanes* (X) and *Allogenes* (XI,3). Thus one can see Sethianism evolving out of Judaism into early Christian and Neo-Platonic cultural contexts, much as did main-line Christianity itself. Indeed these history-of-religions trajectories of Sethianism and Early Christianity are even more parallel in that both emerged from Jewish baptismal sects.⁴⁶

Nag Hammadi tractates also fill gaps in early Christian trajectories themselves. Half of the Pauline corpus presents us with authentic letters of Paul, the oldest Christian texts to have survived. Then the last half of the Pauline corpus shows how Paul was variously interpreted after his death. The latest letters in the Pauline corpus, the Pastoral Epistles, display a mild, "safe" Paul that reassured the canonizers to include him after all, in spite of the (mis)use of him being made by Gnostics and Marcionites. Acts tends to confirm this domesticated Paul.

⁴⁵ Irenaeus (*Adv. haer.* 1.29: "Barbelo-Gnostics"; 1.30: "Ophites" and "Sethians") and Epiphanius (*Panarion* 26: "Gnostics"; 39: "Sethians"; 40: "Archontics"), and *The Untitled Text* from the Bruce Codex.

⁴⁶ Jean-Marie Sevrin has worked out the baptismal dimensions of Sethianism, *Le dossier baptismal séthien: Etudes sur le sacramentaire gnostique* (Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi, Section "Etudes" 2 (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1986).

But the earlier Deutero-Pauline Epistles, Colossians and Ephesians, had pointed in a more speculative, cosmic direction. Paul himself had emphasized that the believer is united with Christ, in baptism indeed dying with Christ. But Paul reserved one's resurrection with Christ for the eschatological future, what Ernst Käsemann drew to our attention as Paul's "eschatological reservation." Yet already Col 2:12 presents the believer as both dying *and* rising with Christ. And Eph 2:6 affirms God has thereupon enthroned the believer "in heavenly places" with Christ. Is not the believer's resurrection then past already?

The canonical texts hesitate actually to put it that way. For a Pastoral Epistle condemns the "godless chatter" of Hymenaeus and Philetus who "will lead people into more and more ungodliness, ... by holding that the resurrection is past already" (2 Tim 2:16-18). Here some kind of shadow-boxing is taking place, where the Pastorals are alluding to some otherwise unattested Christian leaders that clearly had gone too far. The only kind of resurrection for believers that this could be talking about is not physical, but purely spiritual. But if that spiritual resurrection has already taken place, an eschatologically future physical resurrection would have become quite superfluous. Hence the advocates of this "heresy" do not get an unbiased hearing in the New Testament.

But now, *The Treatise on Resurrection* (I,4) presents in a very appealing way precisely this spiritual resurrection that has taken place already, and indeed by appeal to the authority of *the* Apostle *par excellence*, Paul! Should not any objective historian trying to trace the Pauline school include this non-canonical text as part of the left wing of that school along side of the Pastoral Epistles as documentation for the right wing? Or should we limit our knowledge of the left wing of the Pauline school to the smear by the right wing?⁴⁷

⁴⁷ See Lüdemann, *Ketzer*, 133-49, for a full presentation of Colossians, Ephesians, the Pastoral Epistles, and *The Treatise on Resurrection* in this regard.

The Treatise on Resurrection surely goes further than does Paul himself, indeed it would no doubt have been rejected by Paul, as is indicated by such texts as 1 Cor 4:8, where "already" is in effect branded as heretical, and Phil 3:11,20-21, where the believer's resurrection is clearly still future. But neither are the Pastoral Epistles and Acts written as Paul himself would have written. The fact that we are *their* heirs, rather than heirs of the spiritualized Gnostic option, makes them instinctively more congenial to us. But as critical historians we must analyze all the evidence, if we want to assess what the Pauline trajectory or trajectories really was.

A somewhat similar debate may be behind the story of "Doubting Thomas" in John 20:24-29, who needed physical proof of the resurrection to believe. His more spiritual side of the debate may be reflected in *The Gospel of Thomas* and *The Book of Thomas (the Contender)*.⁴⁸

Thus the Nag Hammadi codices have forced us to direct our attention to New Testament "apocrypha" to an extent never before realized. The current edition of Wilhelm Schneemelcher's standard *New Testament Apocrypha* contains eleven Nag Hammadi tractates.⁴⁹ What is even more significant, Helmut Koester's *Introduction to the New Testament* includes sixteen Nag Hammadi tractates.⁵⁰ The field of Early Christian Literature has grown immensely, and we must grow with it!

⁴⁸ Gregory J. Riley, *Resurrection Reconsidered: Thomas and John in Controversy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).

⁴⁹ *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Uebersetzung*, Vol. 1, *Evangelien*, 5th edition, ed. W. Schneemelcher (Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989): *The Apocryphon of James* (I,2), *The Gospel of Thomas* (II,2), *The Gospel of Philip* (II,3), *The Book of Thomas (the Contender)* (II,7), *The Dialogue of the Savior* (III,5), *The (First) Apocalypse of James* (V,3), *The (Second) Apocalypse of James*, and *The Letter of Peter to Philip* (VIII,2); Vol. 2, *Apostolisches; Apokalysen und Verwandtes*: *The Apocalypse of Paul* (V,5), *The Acts of Peter and the Twelve* (VI,1), and *The Apocalypse of Peter* (VII,3).

⁵⁰ Helmut Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Vol. 2, *History and Literature of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982): *The Apocryphon of James* (I,2), *The Gospel of Truth* (I,3; XII,2), *The Apocryphon of John* (II,1; III,1; IV,1; BG 8502,2), *The Gospel of Thomas* (II,2), *The Hypostasis of the Archons* (II,4), *The Book of Thomas (the Contender)* (II,7), *The Gospel of the Egyptians* (III,2;

Perhaps the most lively debate going on in New Testament scholarship as a result of the Nag Hammadi discovery has to do with whether *The Gospel of Thomas* is largely dependent on the canonical Gospels, in which case one might relax and seek to ignore it as purely secondary, or whether it is an independent source of information about the historical Jesus, in which case one should tighten one's belt, perhaps even learn Coptic, and bite the bullet.

Clearly *The Gospel of Thomas* does contain sayings that cannot be derived from the canonical Gospels, since they are not there to be found, yet sayings that in some cases are clearly not Gnostic, but have the same claim to being old, even authentic, as does the older layer of sayings in the canonical Gospels and Q. This can be illustrated by kingdom parables.⁵¹ Saying 97: The kingdom is like a woman who was carrying a jar of meal that, unbeknownst to her, had a hole in it, so that the meal gradually leaked out; by the time she reached home, the jar was empty. Saying 98: The kingdom is like a person who wanted to kill someone, but first tested his dagger by driving it through the mud wall of his house to see if he could do it. Such sayings are not Gnostic inventions, but simply part of the oral tradition of sayings ascribed to Jesus.

What is perhaps even more impressive is that *The Gospel of Thomas* contains some New Testament parables found in their pre-canonical form, that is to say, without Mark's secondary allegorical embellishments.⁵² Saying 9: The Parable of the Sower lacks the allegorical interpretation appended in Mark 4:13-20. Saying 65: The Parable of the Vineyard lacks the allegory of history

IV,2), *The Letter of Eugnostos the Blessed* (III,3; V,1), *The Sophia of Jesus Christ* (III,4), *The Dialogue of the Savior* (III,5), *The (First) Apocalypse of James* (V,3), *The (Second) Apocalypse of James* (V,4), *The Apocalypse of Adam* (V,5), *The Paraphrase of Shem* (VII,1), *The Second Treatise of the Great Seth* (VII,2), and *The Three Steles of Seth* (VII,5).

⁵¹ C.-H. Hunzinger, "Unbekannte Gleichnisse Jesu aus dem Thomas-Evangelium," in *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias*, Beiheft 26 to ZNW, ed. W. Eltester (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960; 2nd ed. 1964), 209-220.

⁵² C.-H. Hunzinger, "Aussersynoptisches Traditionsgut im Thomas-Evangelium," *TLZ* 85 (1960): 843-46.

with which the parable in Mark 12:1-11 is so permeated that even a rather conventional exegete, Werner Georg Kümmel, despaired of being able to disengage a non-allegorical core that could go back to Jesus.⁵³ But now *The Gospel of Thomas* presents us with just such a non-allegorical parable that may well go back to Jesus! Obviously *The Gospel of Thomas* was still in the flowing stream of oral tradition, and was not limited to canonical Gospels, themselves often secondary, and to Gnostic mythology as its sources.

The completely untenable position into which one can in all innocence flounder by ignoring *The Gospel of Thomas* is illustrated by an anecdote from the 1984 meeting of the Society for New Testament Studies in Basel, Switzerland. There Nikolaus Walter of the University of Jena presented a detailed analysis of all instances of Paul using sayings of Jesus, irrespective of whether one is to consider them authentic or not. Having been asked to be the respondent, I pointed out that all the sayings of Jesus that Walter listed were derived from the canonical Gospels, none of which had been written when Paul wrote. Obviously Paul was wholly dependent on oral tradition or non-canonical written sources. Hence sayings ascribed to Jesus outside the canon should be included.

Walter asked for an instance. What I came up with on the spur of the moment was 1 Cor 2:9: "But, as it is written, 'What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him.'" The nearest one had come to identifying the source is Origen's allusion to an *Apocalypse of Elijah* (cited in the margin of the Nestle-Aland *Novum Testamentum Graece*). But now it has cropped up as a saying of Jesus in *The Gospel of Thomas*, Saying 17: "I shall give you what no eye has seen and what no ear has heard and what no hand has touched and what has never occurred to the human mind." Should 1 Cor 2:9 not be included in a survey of Pauline verses parallel to sayings ascribed to Jesus?

⁵³ "Das Gleichnis von den bösen Weingärtnern (Mark. 12.1-5)," in *Aux Sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante dixième anniversaire* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1950), 120-131.

Walter replied that Paul does not quote 1 Cor 2:9 as a saying of Jesus. I reminded him that a whole section of his paper had been devoted to Pauline parallels not ascribed by Paul to Jesus, such as 1 Cor 13:2, about faith that moves mountains, but that are ascribed to Jesus in the canonical Gospels, in this case Matt 17:20; 21:21. Should he not also include non-canonical instances?

Walter finally conceded the point. But when he published his revised paper, it was in this regard unaltered. What could he do? After all, I had handed him a can of worms! Was he, in revising his paper for publication, to go through the whole *Gospel of Thomas*, not to speak of other non-canonical sources, looking for sayings ascribed to Jesus with Pauline parallels? It would be a rather hopeless undertaking for one whose scholarship up to that point had been limited to the canonical text! Better just avoid the whole issue—and thus consign oneself to being part of the past of our discipline, rather than being part of its future!

A decade later, at the 1995 meeting of the Society for New Testament Studies in Prague, The Czech Republic, I succeeded in convincing Barbara Aland, who is currently preparing a revised edition of Kurt Aland's *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, not just to include a very good Greek retroversion of parallel sayings from the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* that Hans-Gebhard Bethge, a member of the *Berliner Arbeitskreis*, is preparing for her, but also to include the Coptic text of *The Gospel of Thomas* itself. I had cited to her as a North American instance John S. Kloppenborg's *Q Parallels*.⁵⁴ She has subsequently written on a very positive note:⁵⁵

The stimulating discussion with you has brought me now to think over basically once again the whole question of the revision of the *Synopse* and in this connection to study Kloppenborg. I am thoroughly

⁵⁴ *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes and Concordance* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988).

⁵⁵ In a letter of October 4, 1995.

impressed by the way he proceeds. To be sure, I would not like to offer a [Greek] translation for all parallel passages, but it is advisable no doubt in Coptic. ... The Aland *Synopsis* must be worked over in regard both to Nag Hammadi and to the Old Testament apocrypha.

The announced publication date of the revised *Synopsis* is 1995.⁵⁶ It is thanks to North American scholarship that this deadline will have to be deferred. But the result will be that not only Americans will have to stare the Coptic text of *The Gospel of Thomas* in the face when we use Kloppenborg's *Q Parallels*, but that worldwide New Testament scholarship will have to face up to the Coptic text in using the standard four-Gospel *Synopsis* of Aland.

North American New Testament scholarship has come a long, long way, when the German establishment turns to an American publication as a role model! This coming of age of American biblical scholarship over the last half-century,⁵⁷ in part due to the Nag Hammadi codices, is itself well worth celebrating!

⁵⁶ Barbara Aland, "Der Arbeit des Instituts 1992-1994," in *Bericht der Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der neutestamentlichen Textforschung für die Jahre 1992 bis 1994* (Münster/Westfalen: Die Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der neutestamentlichen Textforschung, 1995), 18: "The 14th revised edition of the *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* is now in the press and will appear in 1995."

⁵⁷ After the SBL presentation, R. McLauchlin Wilson listed to me distinguished American New Testament scholars of preceding generations, to relativize talk of the discipline only now coming of age in America. But the scope of the presentation was that of the sociology of knowledge, the structures of the discipline, not individuals, where one can only agree heartily with Wilson. Among our predecessors my own role model is at least for me preeminent, Ernest Cadman Colwell. Indeed a major part of his distinction consists in his involving himself actively in such a restructuring of the discipline, in his specialization, New Testament textual criticism: He organized the International Greek New Testament Project and implemented it by means of the ongoing Textual Critical Seminar of SBL. His coming to grips with the restructuring called for in terms of the sociology of knowledge would have been even more prominent, if it had not taken place in the generation dominated by biblical theology on the right and demythologizing, existentialistic hermeneutics on the left.

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

of

THE INSTITUTE FOR ANTIQUITY AND CHRISTIANITY

1. The Coptic Gnostic Library Today
by James M. Robinson
2. The Delphic Maxim ΓΝΩΘΙ ΖΑΥΤΟΝ in Hermetic Interpretation
by Hans Dieter Betz
3. An Enthronement Ritual at Ugarit
by Loren R. Fisher & F. Brent Knutsen
4. Introduction to the Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices
by James M. Robinson
5. Plutarch's Critique of Superstition in the Light of the New Testament
by Herbert Braun
6. Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered
by Rolf P. Knierim
7. Earliest Christianity in Egypt
by Birger A. Pearson
8. Renunciation Towards Social Engineering
by Vincent L. Wimbush
9. The Composition of Q
by John S. Kloppenborg
10. Anecdotes and Arguments
by Burton L. Mack
11. Carl S. Knopf and the IAC Tablet Collection
by Tova Meltzer
12. Adam and Eve and the Serpent in Genesis 1-3
by Elaine H. Pagels
13. Rossi's "Gnostic" Tractate
by Marvin W. Meyer
14. Excavations in the Deep-Structure of the Theological Tradition
by Karen J. Torjesen
15. Chalcedonian Power Politics and the Demise of Pachomian Monasticism
by James E. Goehring
16. Some Observations on the Concept of Sin at Qumran
by Clayton N. Jefford

BT

1391

.R63

1995

**Robinson, James McConkey, 1924-
Nag Hammadi : the first fifty years /
James M. Robinson. -- Claremont, Calif.
: Institute for Antiquity and
Christianity, 1995.**

**38 p. ; 25 cm. -- (Occasional papers
; no. 34.)**

Cover.

Includes bibliographical references.

**1. Nag Hammadi codices--History. 2.
Gnostic literature--Relation to the New
Testament. I. Title II. Series:
Occasional papers (Institute for
Antiquity and Christianity) ; no. 34.**

552040

2 of 7

CCSC

10 OCT 96

34312785

CSTMxc

26. Form and Context in the Royal Inscriptions of Shalmaneser III

by Tammi J. Schneider

27. The Ancient Library of Alexandria and Early Chr. Theological Development
by J. Harold Ellens
28. The Jesus of the Sayings Gospel Q
by James M. Robinson
29. The IAC: Publications of the First Quarter-Century
by Jon Ma. Asgeirsson
30. A Further Fragment of 1QSb: The Schøyen Collection MS 1909
by George J. Brooke & James M. Robinson
31. I Was Thought to Be What I Am Not: Docetic Jesus and the Joh. Tradition
by Gregory J. Riley
32. On the Old Testament's or TaNaK's Spirituality of Human Existence
by Rolf P. Knierim
33. The Origins of Kingship in Israel and Japan: A Comparative Analysis
by Marvin A. Sweeney